

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Indication of Allowability

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the indication by the Examiner that claims 2-10, 12, 14-16, 18, 19, 22-31, 33, 35-37, 39-50, 52, 54-69, 71, 73-79, 81-90, 92 and 94-124 are allowed.

2. Clarification

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the indication by the Examiner that no claims have been withdrawn, despite claims 11, 23-30, 32, 42-51, 61-68, 70, 82-89, 91, 103, 106, 109, 112, 115 and 118 were labeled as such in Applicants' Response to Office Action filed on February 23, 2006.

Applicants re-present the claims for the Examiner's reconsideration, and respectfully request the Examiner to entry the amendments and allow these claims to issue.

2. Rejection Under 35 USC 112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner rejects claims 11, 13, 21, 32, 34, 51, 53, 70, 72, 80, 91, and 93 under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph on the ground that the claims are indefinite.

Claims 11 and 13

The Examiner contends claim 11 is indefinite because it depends from canceled claim 1.

The Examiner further contends that claims 11 and 13 are indefinite for insufficient antecedent basis because they recite the limitations “-C(O)H and -C(O)-C₁₋₃alkyl” in the definition of R₂, R₃ and R₄.

Applicants amend claim 101, from which claims 11 and 13 depend, to recite the limitations “-C(O)H and -C(O)-C₁₋₃alkyl” in the definition of R₂ and R₃, thereby provides proper antecedent basis for claims 11 and 13.

Applicants also amend claim 11 to depend from allowed claim 101; thus obviated the Examiner's rejection.

Applicants believe that claims 11 and 13, as amended are no longer indefinite and respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph.

Claims 21 and 34

The Examiner contends that claims 21 and 34 are indefinite because of insufficient antecedent basis for the recitation of the limitations “-C(O)H and -C(O)-C₁₋₃alkyl” in the definition of R₃ and R₄.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. The Examiner's is drawn to claim 104, from which claims 21 and 34 depend, which recites that R₃ and R₄ “is a moiety selected from the group consisting of hydrogen and a moiety that has a maximum chain length of non-hydrogen atoms of six or less.” Applicants submit “a moiety that has a maximum chain length of non-hydrogen atoms of six or less” covers -C(O)H and -C(O)-C₁₋₃alkyl which, respectively, have one and four non-hydrogen atoms in the backbone of the chain.

Thus, Applicants believe that claim 104 provides antecedent basis for the recitation of “-C(O)H and -C(O)-C₁₋₃alkyl” in claims 21 and 34, and respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 21 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph.

Claims 32, 51, 53, 70, 72, 80, 91, and 93

The Examiner also contends that claims 32, 51, 53, 70, 72, 80, 91 and 93 are indefinite for insufficient antecedent basis for the recitation of the limitations “-C(O)H and -C(O)-C₁₋₃alkyl” in the definitions of R₂, R₃ and R₄.

Applicants amend claim 104, from which claim 32 depends, to add the recitation of the limitations “-C(O)H and -C(O)-C₁₋₃alkyl” to the definition of R₂.

Applicants amend claim 41, from which claim 51 and 53 depend, to add the recitation of the limitations “-C(O)H and -C(O)-C₁₋₃alkyl” to the definition of R₂, R₃ and R₄.

Applicants amend claim 60, from which claim 70 and 72 depend, to add the recitation of the limitations “-C(O)H and -C(O)-C₁₋₃alkyl” to the definition of R₂, R₃ and R₄.

Applicants amend claim 790, from which claim 80 and 91 depend, to add the recitation of the limitations “-C(O)H and -C(O)-C₁₋₃alkyl” to the definition of R₂, R₃ and R₄.

Applicants cancel claim 93, thereby obviating that rejection.

Applicants believe that claims 104, 41, 60 and 79, as amended, provide the needed antecedent basis for the recitation of “-C(O)H and -C(O)-C₁₋₃alkyl” in claims 32, 51 and 53, 70 and 72, and 80 and 91, respectively. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 32, 51, 53, 70, 72, 80 and 91, under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph.

CONCLUSION

Applicants earnestly believe that they are entitled to a letters patent, and respectfully solicit the Examiner to expedite prosecution of this patent application to issuance. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
TAKEDA SAN DIEGO, INC.

Dated: August 9, 2006

By: David J. Weitz
David J. Weitz, General Counsel
& V. P. of Intellectual Property
Reg. No. 38,362

Customer No. 32793
Takeda San Diego, Inc.
10410 Science Center Drive
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (858) 622-8528
Facsimile: (858) 550-0992